

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

David T. Taylor,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:13-1711-BHH
	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
Cire, LLC and Eric J. Causey,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) (ECF No. 74) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, recommending that the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 32) be granted and judgment entered in favor of the plaintiff.

Because the defendants are now *pro se*,<sup>1</sup> this case was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e). Objections to the Report were due by January 30, 2015, and no objections have been filed by any party.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the

---

<sup>1</sup> An Answer (ECF No. 9) to the Amended Complaint was filed by Attorneys I. Ryan Neville and Christy Ford Allen on behalf of the defendants Cire, LLC, and Eric J. Causey on October 15, 2013. A consent motion to withdraw as attorney (ECF No. 47), filed by the defendants’ attorneys, was granted in a text order (ECF No. 49) on August 18, 2014. The defendants did not retain additional counsel.

recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of a timely filed Objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and incorporates the Report, (ECF No. 74), by reference into this Order. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment is GRANTED. Judgment is entered against the defendants in the amount of \$113,688.78.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

February 19, 2015  
Greenville, South Carolina